The College of Charleston Faculty Senate met Tuesday, April 19th, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in ECTR 116. Speaker Bob Mignone called the meeting to order and received approval of the minutes.

Reports

The Speaker began his report by noting that he hoped to see as many faculty as possible at Commencement, May 15th. He also reminded faculty that chairs of Senate and Faculty committees were responsible for calling a meeting of the new committee to elect next year’s chair and for sending him or the Faculty Secretary their committee’s annual report. Next, Mr. Mignone informed the Senate regarding policies and procedures for courtesy appointments. He explained that courtesy appointments are made for people who visit the college in some professional capacity and are not paid. The purpose of a courtesy appointment is to facilitate interaction between the College and other institutions. The Speaker has a document detailing this College policy, should anyone desire further explanation, he said. Next the Speaker reminded Senators that this was our last meeting of the 2004-2005 academic year. He thanked Deb Vaughn for her services as Webmaster and projectionist during Senate meetings, noting that this would be her last meeting to act as projectionist. It is also the end of Julia Eichelberger’s three-year stint as Faculty Secretary. Mr. Mignone thanked both colleagues for their service and said he looked forward to working with Secretary-elect Susan Farrell next year.

The Speaker then invited Laura Lindroth (Health Educator from the Counseling and Substance Abuse Office) to assist him in reporting on the proposed Tobacco Control Policy that her office is helping the SGA to develop. She informed the Senate of the results of a recent campus survey, in which faculty and staff indicated a general willingness to confine smoking to more limited areas and to enforce tobacco control more stringently. This policy would be offered to the Senate sometime next year and would then be sent to the President, who would make the final decision on whether to implement it.

Last year over 700 students signed a petition supporting better enforcement of smoking policies, she noted. The new proposal will attempt to accomplish this through making residence halls 100% smoke-free, clearly marking smoking and non-smoking areas (with special concern for moving smokers away from building entrances), and developing a different system for responding to people who violate these rules. Ms. Lindroth said many respondents to her recent survey were in favor of imposing fines on those who smoked in non-smoking areas, The Office of Public Safety is reluctant to serve as the enforcer for these regulations, however, and Ms. Lindroth said that several other approaches were being considered, such as arming student volunteers with printed cards that would politely remind offenders of their transgressions or congratulate those who were caught obeying the rules. She added that the proposed policy would also ban any tobacco promotions on campus and any acceptance of money from tobacco companies.
Ms. Lindroth said she hoped that the Senate would give her its feedback on the policy and, eventually, its own endorsement when the SG presents it to them in the future. She said that when it is sent to the President, they will also point out that most other South Carolina institutions have much more stringent tobacco restrictions, banning smoking in dorms and in all indoor buildings. Ms. Lindroth detailed a number of the responses to the questions that were in her survey, and answered questions from the floor as they arose. David Gentry (Psychology) spoke against the ban on accepting direct funding from tobacco companies, even for research. He noted that these companies “fund a lot of research on smoking.” Ms. Lindroth replied that our credibility would be weakened if we tried to discourage smoking, yet accepted money that was generated by the sale of tobacco. Reid Wiseman (Biology) asked Ms. Lindroth if her office was planning to conduct a similar survey on the use of “other drugs besides nicotine,” which he believed were a more serious problem. Ms. Lindroth said such a survey was conducted annually, and Mr. Mignone added that the President takes this problem seriously enough to be forming a drug and alcohol task force.

New Business
By-Laws Committee

Glen Lesses, chair of the committee, brought two motions for the Senate’s approval, explaining that if the Senate approved these motions by a two-thirds majority, then the question would be sent by written ballot to the entire faculty. The first motion read as follows:

Revise the eligibility for Senate membership in III, Article IV, Section 2, A so as to insert the following revisions in caps:

Department Chairs, REGARDLESS OF THEIR TEACHING LOADS, are eligible to serve as Faculty Senators.

Rationale:
When the Faculty Senate by-laws were originally written, no chairs taught less than six contact hours per semester. As the College has changed, chairs have often received administrative and/or research reductions which result in their teaching less than six contact hours. From the inception of the Senate, the faculty has treated chairs as eligible for Senate membership and distinguished them from full-time administrators with limited teaching duties. This revision preserves our historical practice and eliminates possible eligibility confusion between chairs and full-time administrators who are faculty.

Mr. Lesses explained that this amendment was meant to honor the spirit of the present definition of Senate eligibility. In the course of the committee’s deliberations, someone asked whether administrators could therefore serve on the Senate, if they teach a similar amount. The By-laws committee decided that chairs with administrative duties were properly considered as faculty, and that they wanted to retain the distinction between
faculty and administrators, making chairs eligible to serve regardless of teaching load. He added that the manual notes that people with administrative appointments can be excluded from faculty deliberations. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously, which means that the faculty as a whole will be asked to ratify it by written ballot.

Mr Lesses then presented a second motion, as follows:

Revise the duties of the Educational Technology Committee (III, Article V, Section 3, 16, b) to include a new item (6):

To serve as regular members of the President's Information Technology Council, representing the faculty in strategic and tactical information technology policies, projects, and planning.

Rationale:
At the last Senate meeting, the Educational Technology Committee made a two-part motion to amend the By-Laws. This motion was automatically sent for review to the By-Laws Committee. The By-Laws Committee recommends against adoption of the first part of the motion concerning changes to the membership on the ETC. The Nominations Committee would have serious difficulty in implementing distributional requirements for standing committees and makes a good faith effort to staff committees with suitable faculty from throughout the College. The By-Laws Committee favors the 2nd part of the ETC motion. This change in duties will help insure adequate faculty representation on the President's Information Technology Council. Please note that although the faculty can change its by-laws, the President's Information Technology Council is not under faculty purview. The Speaker, however, has vetted this proposal with appropriate College administrators.

Bob Mignone noted that after this motion was proposed at the March 29th Senate meeting, he discussed it with the President, who is willing for the committee to be so constituted. Mr. Lesses said that his committee agreed with the new duties in the motion, but were against the stipulations about membership. “This is because it is extremely difficult for the Nominations Committee to come up with the kind of membership that is proposed here,” Mr. Lesses said. He thought it was enough to “rely on the good faith efforts of the Nominations Committee.” David Gentry (Psychology) asked if this policy could be changed when we got a new President. Mr. Mignone replied that it was unlikely that a future president would undertake to change existing by-laws, but that it still could be done.

Frank Kinard (Chemistry) suggested the motion should be amended to make this less than a hard and fast requirement. This committee “is making decisions on large amounts of money, so every school should be involved,” yet Nominations may not be able to implement this in every year if not enough people volunteer, he said. Alex Kasman suggested that the motion be amended to read as follows:
“It is stated as a goal that the committee membership should include a faculty member from each academic school, one from the graduate school, one from the library, and a student.”

After some discussion, the members of the By-laws committee agreed to accept this as a friendly amendment. Marion Doig (Chemistry) asked, “So we’re going to vote to do what we currently do?” Mr. Mignone said that such representation is already “the implicit goal” for the Nominations Committee, “but in this case it is stated explicitly.” The Senate then voted in favor of the motion.

**Committee on Academic Standards**

Deb Vaughn, Chair, brought the following motion for the committee, proposing that a grade of XF be added.

**Memorandum**

To: Academic Standards Committee

From: Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students

Patrick McShay, Honor Board Chairman

Re: Proposal to add the XF grade as a sanction option within the Honor System

**Introduction**

Many institutions now employ the grade of XF on a transcript to communicate the outcome of an Honor System process. The grade of XF is intended to “denote a failure to accept and exhibit the fundamental value of academic honesty” (Univ. of MD). This element of an honor system has been successfully introduced to a number of schools in recent years, including University of Maryland at College Park, University of Tennessee, University of Georgia, University of Minnesota, and Kansas State University.

**Rationale**

To insure consistency in sanction outcomes: Currently each Board or Panel called to set sanctions has some latitude when designing sanctions. Training insures that each Board/Panel works within a set range of sanctions, depending on the nature of the offense, relevant mitigating circumstances and other factors. Sanctions, however, can and do vary for roughly similar violations. The adoption of the XF would guarantee that similar violations would have at least one component of the sanction in common.

To increase the deterrent value of sanctions: The XF recorded on a transcript would announce to other schools that a student seeking to transfer in is leaving an institution with a mixed record. Knowing the “public” nature of the XF should make students think
hard before performing an act of academic dishonesty. Moreover, the proposal below argues for combining the XF grade with disciplinary suspension for at least one semester as the minimum sanction for our typical “serious” honor code violations.

To communicate to other institutions a more accurate reflection of a student’s academic record while at the College of Charleston: Many students currently receive Fs from faculty for academic dishonesty. The complete explanation for the failing grade rests only with the complainant-faculty and the dean of students. Students are at liberty to offer any explanation they desire for the failing grade to other institutions. The XF clearly communicates to admissions officers why the student failed the course.

To relieve faculty of any guesswork in determining the appropriate grade impact for an act of academic dishonesty: Faculty frequently ask what others do about the grade after a finding of academic dishonesty. Many turn to department chairpersons, the dean of students, and other colleagues for guidance when deciding about the grade impact.

To insure greater consistency of the grade impact for acts of dishonesty: Based on casual observation, roughly 50% of faculty assign failing grades for acts of academic dishonesty and 50% assign a zero grade for the individual assignment and re-calculate the overall course grade. Under this proposal, faculty would have to assign a XF in the course once the finding of in violation is established and offense merits a XF.

Operation

1. Schedule of Sanctions for Violations of Academic Dishonesty (significantly adapted from Millersville State University, PA)

   A. Class 1. The most serious breaches of academic honesty fall into this category, as well as any and all second or more offenses of any sort. Sanctions: 1) XF grade and suspension, or 2) XF grade and expulsion. Examples of violations include, but are not limited to:

   i. cheating on a test which involves premeditation and conspiracy of effort,
   ii. taking a test for someone else, or permitting someone else to take a test or course in one's place,
   iii. plagiarizing, where the majority of the submitted work was written or created by another,
   iv. obtaining, stealing, buying, or sharing all or part of an unadministered exam,
   v. selling, or giving away all or part of an unadministered test,
   vi. bribing, or attempting to bribe any other person to obtain an unadministered test or any information about the test,
   vii. buying, or otherwise acquiring, another's course paper and resubmitting it as one's own work, whether altered or not
viii. entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of changing a
grade in a grade book, on a test, or on other work for which a grade is
given,
ix. changing, altering, or being an accessory to changing and/or altering a
grade in a grade book, on a test, on a "Change of Grade" form, or other
official academic college record which relates to grades, and
x. entering a building, office, or computer for the purpose of obtaining an
unadministered test.

B. Class 2. These include other offenses for which strong sanctions are applied.
Sanctions: 1) grade of XF in the course and disciplinary probation and other
educational sanctions or 2) grade of XF and suspension. Examples of
violations include, but are not limited to:

i. cheating on an exam which does not involve premeditation,
ii. copying from another's test or allowing another student to copy from
your test, where no prior plans were made for such collaboration,
iii. plagiarizing, where a small portion of the submitted work was written or
created by another,
iv. submitting work for a class that was already submitted for another, when
unauthorized,
v. intentionally failing to cite information from the correct source,
vi. listing sources in a bibliography that were not used in the paper, and
vii. copying, or allowing one to copy, homework assignments that are to be
submitted for credit.
viii. unauthorized collaboration on an assignment

C. Class 3. These include offenses where evidence of student confusion and/or
ignorance is obvious. Sanctions: 1) probation and other educational sanctions
or 2) warning. Examples include, but are not limited to:

i. record of same offense made on other similar assignments and no
feedback provided by the instructor prior to allegation.
ii. submitting work for a class that was already submitted for another
without permission of the professor
iii. unintentionally, failing to cite information from the correct source

2. XF Grade Policy

A. If the Honor Board sanctions a student with a course grade of XF, and this
sanction is not appealed by the student, the Dean of Students and the faculty
member notify the Registrar to place a grade of XF for the applicable course
on the student's academic record. The grade XF shall be recorded on the
student's transcript with the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty."

B. Student appeals of the XF grade follow the procedure for all other appeals of
academic dishonesty sanctions, as outlined in the Student Handbook. If the
Appellate Board denies the right to another hearing, or another hearing is
granted and the Honor Board decides to uphold the XF grade sanction, the Dean of Students and the faculty member notify the Registrar to assign the XF grade to the student's academic record.

C. If grades are due but an academic dishonesty hearing is still in progress, a grade of 'I' shall be applied to the course until the hearing process is complete.

D. An XF grade shall maintain a quality point value of 0.0. The grade "XF" shall be treated in the same way as an "F" for the purposes of Grade Point Average, course repeatability, and determination of academic standing.

E. The XF must stay on the transcript for at least two years from the date student is found in violation.

F. After two years, a student may petition the Honor Board to exchange the XF for an F. The petition must be in written form and provide the reason for removal of the XF. Additionally, the petitioner must appear before the Honor Board to explain the request. If the student petitions and a majority of the Honor Board agree to remove the XF, the Honor Board outlines conditions under which the XF is removed. The conditions may include giving testimony of dishonesty during freshman orientation or other organized Honor Board events, and/or performing specific tasks aimed at increasing the education of the violator and/or campus on the value of academic integrity. When these conditions are met, the XF is removed entirely from the transcript, leaving no past evidence of the XF. A grade of F is recorded in its place.

G. If a petition to change an XF grade to an F has been made and denied, another petition may not be made for another year from the date of denial. This stipulation applies after graduation as well.

H. If the student is/has been found responsible of an additional violation of academic honesty, either in the past or future, the XF remains. For cases where the XF was changed to an F and the student is later found responsible of an additional act of academic dishonesty, the XF grade is restored for the course. In these cases, the XF remains permanent. The student may not petition for an F in exchange for the XF in these cases.

I. A student who has received an XF in a course and needs to pass the course for a requirement may retake the course. If the student passes the course, the requirement is met, but the original course grade will remain as an XF unless the X is removed by an accepted petition for removal.
Ms. Vaughn invited Dean Jeri Cabot to explain the need for this motion. Ms. Cabot noted that the Provost and a faculty member had initiated this discussion during the past year. She told the Senate that recent surveys have noted an increase in students who, by their own admission, have plagiarized via the Internet, or have cheated in other ways. This increase is reflected at the College, Ms. Cabot said. Last year the Honor Board heard over 60 plagiarism and cheating cases, and in 100% of them the students were found responsible, since “you faculty members come prepared,” she said. Faculty have said they would like some consistent minimum sanction that the Honor Board would be compelled to use. This proposed XF will stay on a student’s record for 2 years, with students having the opportunity to petition in 2 years for it to be removed. The Registrar has told her that this will not be a problem to implement, she said. Policies like this one exist on other campuses. It was first implemented at the University of Maryland, and is an option at UVA. At Kansas State, the grade can’t be removed until student takes an ethics seminar.

Ms. Cabot said that if the Senate endorses the proposal, it will be discussed in the classroom for an full academic year before being implemented, so there would be time for it to go into syllabi and the College catalog. Alex Kasman (Mathematics) asked, “What if the professor does not want the grade to be an XF--will there be an option?” Ms. Cabot said that it would not be the professor’s decision. Reid Wiseman noted that for a senior who was found guilty, this would amount to a harsher punishment than it would for a freshman, and he thought the Honor Board should be sure to stress this to students. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) said she was concerned with items 6, 7, and 8, especially the listing of sources in a bibliography that are not in a paper. “This could have happened by accident,” she noted, if “a student takes out a portion of a draft, but then forgets to take it out of the bibliography. That’s a little scary, and so is the homework,” she said. “I allow collaboration on homework,” which means that “it’s possible for students to copy rather than collaborating. This is an issue that I as a professor want to use my judgment on, and this statement does not leave room for that.” She thought that this and item #5 should be moved into Class 3, which does not warrant an XF penalty.

George Pothering (Computer Science) asked about retaking the course students got an XF in, and Ms. Cabot said students could retake the course later. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said she thought some faculty might choose not to report such things to the Honor Board if they didn’t want the student to receive such a strong penalty. Ms. Cabot answered that this proposal was “an opportunity for us to show how seriously we take academic integrity. If you think this is an honest mistake, you can send it back to students to redo,” but if you suspect actual cheating, then this sanction would show that we take this very seriously. Erin Beutel said her students made mistakes like this all the time because they just didn’t know how to document properly. Elizabeth Jurisich said that students might just be too lazy to look something up, and an XF was too harsh a penalty. Even unauthorized collaboration on homework should not receive an XF, she said. Frank Kinard noted that this would show up on a student’s transcript. “If they are convicted of a crime, does it show up on the transcript?” he wondered. “No, but I am working on this,” said Ms. Cabot. Alex Kasman said that he believe a grade reflected the knowledge gained in a course, and that even a student who cheats may not deserve an F; this is something
the teacher should control, he said. Julie Davis wondered whether the classification of “work already submitted for another class” should be considered plagiarism. “If the instructor hasn’t made clear that these things are not acceptable, isn’t that the professor’s responsibility to tell students?” she wondered. Ms. Cabot said that some faculty have told her that they think “this is something you should come to college knowing, that you don’t recycle work.” Aliss Whitt noted that the Honor Code already forbids the recycling of work, unless the professor has deemed this acceptable.

Joe Kelly (At-large), spoke in support of the proposal, noting that “Most people in English think this is long overdue.” Reid Wiseman asked, “Is there any way that every incoming freshmen could receive a written copy of it and sign a contract that they have read it?” Ms. Cabot said that all students read and sign the Honor Code during their orientation. Charles Kaiser (Psychology) said that in his department, “Faculty are sometimes not clear on how they define plagiarism and students come and complain.” He thought some of the items in class II “should be scrutinized more carefully. Students may get too harshly punished just because they don’t understand. I’m a little bit leery about the level of punishment.” Todd Grantham (Philosophy) spoke in support of the overall plan, noting that “last semester I had five students who copied from internet. I think this is a serious problem that we should do something about.” He suggested moving items 6 and 7 from class II into class III, which Ms. Vaughn said she would consider a friendly amendment. Bob Perkins said that his department did not support this proposal because “it takes away our rights as faculty members to give a grade. Right now I have that promise in my syllabus— you’ll get an F if convicted of plagiarism.” With this proposal, that decision is out of the faculty member’s hands, he said.

Darryl Phillips (Classics, Italian, German, and Japanese) said that in the past year his department “was responsible for at least 25% of the Honor Board convictions, even though we are one of the smallest departments. This is a faculty-friendly initiative,” he said, because it will protect faculty from “the bargaining that goes on” when a student faces a charge of plagiarism. He said that as a department chair he has often had to face “the teary student who says ‘I never meant to do this’” (i.e., to download and submit a paper from the Internet). He also said he felt that this penalty “is more than an F—it’s also an F for honor code violations. This is appropriate for serious violations of academic integrity. I think it’s wonderful to put this in the hands of the Honor Board and not faculty, so the Honor Board can take the heat.”

Allan Strand wondered if there were evidence showing that this penalty would deter cheating. Ms. Cabot replied that she did not know of such evidence, but “on other campuses [with this policy] I have heard that students understand more clearly the implications of their actions. I think the system that hasn’t worked is the single-sanction system, such as at UVA,” she added, since faculty who find that sanction too harsh may choose not to report violations. She said she thought this sanction would make it clear to anyone looking at a transcript “that something went amiss” and that for this reason, students would be less likely to cheat. Terry Bowers (English) spoke in support of the proposal, saying, “This is the institution sanctioning the student, not just the professor or the department. This is the institution saying they take cheating very seriously, and this is
important because an atmosphere can develop very quickly where students decide to cheat because they think they can get away with it.”

Myra Seaman (English) also supported the proposal, noting that students are sometimes confused by what is expected of them in different departments and this policy might help to clarify and standardize expectations. Aliss Whitt (Library) said she had been “been reading a lot about plagiarism lately” for a research project, “and one of the things that keeps coming to the forefront” in her reading was that faculty don’t define plagiarism clearly enough and don’t really understand the dimension of the problem. “So if we vote on this we need to do more to educate our colleagues,” including adjuncts, she said. Carol Toris (Psychology) said she supported the policy, but also thought that lying should be included, since she was certain students sometimes lied in offering excuses for missing tests, for example. The Speaker noted that the only matter that was actually before the Senate was adding the XF grade as an option for the Honor Board. “I’m allowing this discussion because it’s pertinent,” he said, but penalties for additional violations would have to be worked out later, he said. Oleg Smirnov (Mathematics) spoke against the proposal, saying that “the professor should be responsible for the grade, and I can envision situations where this would not be the grade I would want to assign.”

Jack Parsons asked, “If we approve the [creation of the XF] grade, when will the other parts of the proposal be worked out?” Jeri Cabot asked the Speaker if the Senate could approve the proposal “in principle and ask that the particulars be worked on further.” Mr. Mignone said that rather than amending each of the items in the proposal that had caused concern, the Senate could “trust the good faith of the honor board to work out these details. Or, we can start the process of amending, or send it to the committee.”

David Gentry said that if the Senate approved this policy, it would be more than just giving the XF as an option; we would be “voting on giving up our ability to assign a grade.” Mr. Mignone said that he believed that the vote was only on the existence of the XF grade, and not the whole document on how the grade would be assigned. “You can vote to overrule me on that,” he added. Jack Parsons said he wanted to challenge this interpretation, and after some discussion with the Parliamentarian, the Senate rejected the Speaker’s view of the proposal on a voice vote. Then, by a show of hands, the Senate voted in favor of referring this proposal to the Committee for review.

Next, the Senate considered the Committee’s second motion, which read as follows:

Faculty Committee on Academic Standards
Probation and Readmission for Visiting Maymester / Summer Session Students

Currently, the College of Charleston Undergraduate catalog does not address students who left the College with a GPA below 2.0 and wish to return as visiting students. The present catalog (pages 10 and 20) indicates that students who leave here with a GPA below 2.0 must reapply to the College through Admissions as well as enroll in Learning Strategies (EDLS 100). This scenario is not practical or possible for visiting students who want to be here during the summer only.
Existing Wording

Page 10:
2. Students who have been dismissed from the College for academic deficiency or separated for disciplinary reasons and who complete the suspension period will be considered for readmission....Those whose records indicate that they can reach the graduation standards in a reasonable period of time and for those that have met the conditions required for reconsideration must meet the following conditions for readmission:
   a. They must complete a special one-day workshop that contains information on the services that the College provides for students with academic difficulties, the academic requirements they must satisfy, and their personal responsibilities in reaching good academic standing. Most students will be required to enroll in the course, Learning Strategies (EDLS 100), to attain these skills necessary to succeed at college.
   b. Each student must sign a readmission contract prepared by the Office of Undergraduate Studies. The contract specifies the grade point average (GPA) and other specific requirements that readmitted students must meet in order to remain at the College of Charleston.
3. Students who voluntarily leave the College while on probation may be readmitted conditionally in accordance with 2 (a, b) above.
4. Students who voluntarily leave the College and who are not on probation, but who have less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA, will be readmitted conditionally in accordance with 2 (a, b) above.
5. Students who previously attended the College as provisional students but failed to meet the conditions of the program must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 30 semester hours at another institution before applying for readmission. They will be considered for admission only if they meet the admission standards applied to transfer students.

Page 20:
Academic Probation Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits earned</th>
<th>GPA required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-59</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and up</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a student’s cumulative GPA at the end of any semester is less that the grade point average required as listed above, the student in placed on academic probation. A student on academic probation must do two things:

1. Make up the GPA deficiency in the next 15 credit hours attempted. (It is recommended that not all 15 credits be attempted together.)
2. Enroll in EDLS 100 Learning Strategies during the next fall or spring semester. EDLS 100 is not counted toward the 15 credits above.

Proposed Wording
Visiting students to the College of Charleston for summer sessions must adhere to the same academic standards as College of Charleston degree-seeking students. Students who have previously earned less than a 2.0 GPA while attending the College or who are not in good standing at their home institutions will normally not be permitted to enroll for summer sessions. However, instances where these students have gone on to demonstrate a proven academic track record at other universities or who have been granted permission to complete courses as part of their degree programs at other universities may petition the Office of Maymester / Summer Sessions along with the Office of Undergraduate Studies for permission to enroll. Petitions will be handled on a case-by-case basis. A student granted permission to enroll in a summer session is not guaranteed admission or readmission during a subsequent semester.

**Rationale**

The proposed catalog change would allow Summer School administrators flexibility in working with visiting students who have had academic problems at the College of Charleston in the past.

This motion passed on a voice vote. David Gentry, noting that it was now 6:30 and there were many items still on the agenda, moved to adjourn for the evening and continue the following Tuesday. A vote was taken and the meeting was adjourned.

On Tuesday, April 26, when the Senate reconvened, the Speaker noted that there was a slight procedural confusion because once he had declared that the motion to adjourn had passed, the meeting was over. No one who believed that perhaps the “ayes” had not carried the motion could have called for a division of the house (a show of hands) because, as the Speaker noted, “the house had left.” In the future, therefore, he will be sure to call for a division of the house if he faces a similar situation.

**Curriculum Committee**

Deborah Boyle, committee chair, presented the following proposals.

1. S05-14 BS in Computer Science/BA in Computer Science/BS in Computer Information Systems – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
2. S05-15 CSCI 360 Software Architecture and Design – Proposal to Change a Course
3. S05-16 CSCI 362 Software Engineering – Proposal to Change a Course
4. S05-17 CSCI 462 Software Engineering Practicum - Proposal to Change a Course
5. S05-18 ARTH 420 Preservation Law and Economics – New Course Proposal
6. S05-19 PORT 313 Advanced Portuguese Composition – New Course Proposal
7. S05-20 PORT 314 Advanced Portuguese Conversation – New Course Proposal
8. S05-21 PORT 330 Collateral Studies – New Course Proposal
10. S05-23 LTPO 270 Studies in Brazilian Film – New Course Proposal
11. S05-24 LTPO 280 Studies in Brazilian Civilization and Culture through Literature – New Course Proposal
12. S05-25 PORT 390 Special Topics in Portuguese – Proposal to Change a Course
13. S05-26 Environmental Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor (Add GEOL 213)
14. S05-27 Environmental Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for a Minor (Add SOCY 346)
15. S05-28 Women’s Studies Minor – Proposal to Change Degree Requirement for a Minor
16. S05-29 EDFS 326 Technology for Teachers – Proposal to Change a Course
17. S05-30 Self-Designed Major – Proposal for a New Major
18. S05-31 COMM 414 Mass Media and Society – New Course Proposal
19. S05-32 Major in Communication (Concentration in Media Studies) – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major
20. S05-33 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (add one course from new distribution group)
21. S05-34 BA in Religious Studies – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major (increase hours required)
22. S05-35 RELS 280 Religion and Film – New Course Proposal
23. S05-36 Archaeology Minor – Proposal for a New Interdisciplinary Minor
24. S05-37 BS teaching option in Biology – Proposal to Change Degree Requirements for the Major

All these proposals were passed except a proposal for a Self-Designed Major, which would require 36 hours of multidisciplinary coursework; a new faculty committee would review and approve each proposal. Glen Lesses began the discussion of the proposal by saying “I have a number of questions.” He wondered why the proposal required 3 faculty advisors, when the major might have only 2 core areas. He wondered why there were 36 hours to the major, and why the senior thesis was defined differently from the present Bachelor’s Essay. “Even though I think there’s much to commend the major,” he said, he had many concerns about approving it. For example, “this new faculty committee strikes me as overly bureaucratic.” Mr. Lesses said he thought it would be proper for all members of the core departments to scrutinize a student’s proposal, rather than only the chair and the committee.” He concluded that the proposal still needed more work.

Kay Smith, Vice President for the Academic Experience, spoke on behalf of the committee that developed this new proposal. (Its chair, Amy McCandless, was absent due to a death in the family.) Ms. Smith invited anyone else on the committee to be recognized at this time, but no committee members were present. Jack Parson said that he shared Mr. Lesses’ “concerns and worries about the proposal as it stands.” He stated that he found it “curious” that this proposal contained “no letters of support from departments,” something that is normal protocol when a new major or minor proposal may appear to overlap with the work of an existing department. “Since all departments are affected they should all have been asked to support it,” he said. The deans had written letters of support, but without discussing this with their chairs. He suggested that some departments, if they discussed the proposal, might conclude that they did not wish to be
included as a possible component of such a major, or they might wish to include further regulations in the major. Mr. Parsons asked Ms. Boyle why departments had not been asked to discuss this major before it was brought before the Senate. She said that the committee had not discussed that issue. Provost Elise Jorgens said, “The deans did discuss this on two or three occasions.” Mr. Parsons asked, “How many departments have discussed this?”

Frank Kinard then asked when in a student’s career this major must be declared. Could it be used as a “roll-your-own” major that a student assembles after finding a traditional major too rigorous? Kay Smith said that it could not be declared after a student had completed 75 hours. Mr. Kinard thought 75 hours was too much, but Ms. Smith said that at Appalachian State, students were more likely to devise such a major after having done a fair amount of coursework; the 75-hour limit would also allow transfer students a little time to devise such a major, since many of them come here with 60 hours. Ms. Boyle said this 75-hour requirement was something the Curriculum committee did discuss. Reid Wiseman lauded “the polymathic intent” of the proposal, but said it amounted to “3 mini-minors.” Ms. Jorgens disagreed, saying that students were required to demonstrate that their self-designed major was “a coherent curriculum and not 3 separate curricula.” Ms. Boyle added that such a major “would let students develop things they wouldn’t be able to do otherwise with existing courses.” Joe Benich asked if this major would mean that students had to take fewer upper-level courses, since so many of those courses have prerequisites, but Ms. Smith said students had to take all prerequisites, separate and apart from their specific majors. Ms. Boyle said that the proposal did not specify a requirement of 300-level courses as such. Mr. Kinard asked about how many transfer credits could be applied toward this major. “I would think that substitutions would be subject to committee approval,” Ms. Boyle said.

Claire Curtis (Political Science) asked about the GPA requirement of 3.0. Ms. Boyle said that was not a graduation requirement but a requirement for enrollment. Ms. Curtis said she thought this would have to be a major for “a highly motivated student” and that its GPA requirement should be higher than a 3.0. Todd Grantham (At-large) said it appeared to him that there was considerable scrutiny and rigor built in, since a student has to submit a transcript and, as Ms. Boyle added, letters of recommendation. Norris Preyer (Physics) asked why such a course of study would not be met with a combination of an existing minor and major. Ms. Boyle said that this was what the student had to explain in the proposal. The Provost said that there were “not very many students who need or want” this option. Kay Smith said that it was helpful for interdisciplinary studies “or for very specific career goals, such as ethnographic photography.” Norris Preyer wondered if this could allow students to be exempt from the normal co-curricular requirements of one of the core disciplines. Ms. Boyle said that this would be up to the departments approving the proposal. Glen Lesses said that this was why he thought the whole department, not just the chair, should scrutinize a proposal; he was not mollified by Ms. Boyle’s comment that there would be 3 faculty advisors and at least two disciplines represented on each student’s major. Betsy Martin (At-large) added, “The idea that departments will be involved without discussion at the department level, seems to me a drastic thing. Now a person will be able to have the name of a deparment”
on his or her degree without their coursework being “discussed and bought into by the department,” which “seems to be a very drastic step.” Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance) asked, “Is there any obligation of a faculty member to do this?” He also wondered about “what counts as a faculty member.” There was no obligation, Ms. Boyle said, but the proposal does not define who is a faculty member.

Joe Kelly said, “I’m happy with the department chair signing off” on a proposal, but suggested as a friendly amendment that the proposals needed departmental approval, rather than department chair approval. Ms. Boyle accepted this amendment, and then Kay Smith asked if this meant a majority of department members, so Mr. Kelly said it could be worded as “approved at a department meeting.” Norris Preyer asked if we needed to get the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee to accept that amendment, but the Speaker pointed out that none of the committee were present. Mr. Parsons asked if the whole proposal therefore “now belongs to the Curriculum Committee.” Mr. Mignone said he ruled that it did. David Gentry asked if this new major required CHE approval, and the Provost said that it did require such approval. Frank Kinard thought that this major was being defined in the catalog in a way that might enable students to get a degree even if the committee did not believe they had satisfied the requirement. “How could that happen?” wondered Ms. Boyle. The student defines the requirements, the committee approves them, and those are the ones the student must meet.

Jack Parson said that he agreed with Claire Curtis that “this is not a high bar.” This major could require a lot of time from faculty just in putting a proposal together, he said, so students should not be encouraged to do so if they are not highly motivated. He argued that a GPA of 3.5 or “normally 3.5” should be required. He also suggested it should be made clear that “no student is entitled to this major” and that if their proposal is turned down, there should be no appeal. “I worry about students who are not strong, complaining they were wrongly denied the chance to design their own major.” Ms. Boyle noted that the current proposal specifies that a student can appeal decisions to the Academic Standards committee, and Mr. Parsons said he thought this should not be available to students.

Darryl Phillips then said, “As the chair of a department that has a lot of unusual course in it, I’m concerned about resources. If a student has to project a course of study in 2 years and departments are not planning their schedules that far ahead, it could impose a burden on departments who have to support other minors and have the pressure of cancelling courses because of insufficient enrollment.” Kay Smith said that when a course turns out to be unavailable, a student can apply to the committee to make a substitution. She said that at Appalachian, the self-designed majors “never had more than about 45 students” so that this should not be a very large number. Mr. Phillips replied, “I would be afraid that this would mean more pressure for faculty to conduct independent studies.” He noted that faculty are already doing such teaching that is not credited as part of their workload, and “we don’t need to add any more” to that burden.

Erin Beutel (Geology) said she thought the discussion was too one-sided since the original committee was not here to respond, and moved that the proposal should go back
to this Ad Hoc committee to address today’s concerns. Mr. Parsons observed, “The ad hoc committee gave this to our committee [Curriculum] that has now recommended it to us. Now, I think, the new [2005-2006] curriculum committee is the one to take it up, since this year’s committee did not do this. I urge we remand to our committee and ask them especially to look at department participation.” Ms. Beutel said she thought it should go back to the original committee. The Speaker said that in that case, the Senate would be voting to reconstitute the now-disbanded Ad Hoc committee, then remand this proposal to them. Ms. Beutel said that she would accept remanding the proposal to Curriculum instead, as a friendly amendment. Terry Bowers asked if we were now suggesting that Curriculum consult departments. Mr. Parsons said such consultation is already called for on the Curriculum proposal form—that any departments affected by this major must attach letters saying that their department has discussed it—and he thought the Curriculum committee should use this process for this self-designed major. Joe Benich called the question, and that call was passed. At long last, the Senate took a vote on the amendment to the proposal (to remand it to next year’s Curriculum Committee), and this passed unanimously.

**Committee on Graduate Education**

Sarah Owens, committee chair, proposed the following changes and additions to the Graduate curriculum. All were passed:

**MS Accountancy Programs**
- **Proposal for a New Graduate Course**
  - HTMT 520—Independent Study in Hospitality and Tourism
  - DSCI 520—Independent Study in Decision Sciences
  - TRAN 520—Independent Study in Logistics and Transportation
- **HTMT 560 –Special Topics in Hospitality and Tourism**
- **DSCI 560—Special Topics in Decision Sciences**
- **TRAN 560—Special Topics in Logistics and Transportation**

**Proposal for a New Graduate Course**
- **ENGL 537 Contemporary British Literature**
- **HSPR 520 Preservation Law and Economics**

**Proposal to Change a Graduate Course**
- **ENGL 527 British Fiction 1900 to Present**
- **PUBA 777 Internship**

**Proposal to Change a Graduate Program**
- **Master of Public Administration (chance to degree requirements)**

**Resolution on Implementation of the Labor Day Holiday**

George Hopkins (History) proposed the following as a charge for the 2005-2006 Faculty Welfare Committee.
It is hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate charge the Faculty Welfare Committee [newly elected] to explore options for the observance of Labor Day as an official holiday for College of Charleston students, staff, and faculty and to report back to the Senate at its October 2005 meeting.

Rationale: On October 5, 2004, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution urging the College to observe Labor Day as a holiday. Given the complications of adjusting the College calendar, the Speaker [with Senate approval] on November 30 charged the Faculty Welfare Committee with providing the Senate with choices on how to implement observance of Labor Day. At the March 29 meeting, the committee presented a draft motion and then agreed to present a revised motion at the next meeting. According to the committee chair, the committee could not agree on a new motion for the April 19 meeting. Therefore, I ask the Faculty Senate to charge the newly elected committee to explore options for observing Labor Day and to report back at the October Senate meeting.

Mr. Hopkins noted that earlier this year, the Senate had already approved a resolution that the College find a way to observe the Labor Day Holiday. “Given the complications of the College calendar,” this year’s Welfare committee was not able to come up with a suitable plan, he said. He wants next year’s Welfare committee to do further study on how the Labor Day holiday is implemented elsewhere (for example, at the University of South Carolina). In answer to a question, Mr. Hopkins clarified that he wished for the committee to study the problem and report to the Senate at the October 2005 meeting. His proposal was then passed by the Senate.

There were no Constituents’ Concerns offered except by the Speaker, who reminded Senators that if they were dissatisfied with any procedure during a meeting, they always had the right to raise a point of order, and that they were, of course, free to contact him personally as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. Here ended the 2004-2005 Faculty Senate business, a torrent of verbiage (occasionally interrupted by important decisions) that it has been this Secretary’s privilege to record.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Eichelberger
Faculty Secretary